Global Stabilization of Triangular Systems with Time-Delayed Dynamic Input Perturbations

P. Krishnamurthy and F. Khorrami
Control/Robotics Research Laboratory (CRRL)
Dept. of Electrical and Computer Engineering
NYU Tandon School of Engineering
Brooklyn, NY 11201, USA
Email: {prashanth.krishnamurthy,khorrami}@nyu.edu

arXiv:1704.05936v1 [math.OC] 19 Apr 2017

***Abstract*—A control design approach is developed for a general class of uncertain strict-feedback-like nonlinear systems with dynamic uncertain input nonlinearities with time delays. The system structure considered in this paper includes a nominal uncertain strict-feedback-like subsystem, the input signal to which is generated by an uncertain nonlinear input unmodeled dynamics that is driven by the entire system state (including unmeasured state variables) and is also allowed to depend on time delayed versions of the system state variable and control input signals. The system also includes additive uncertain nonlinear functions, coupled nonlinear appended dynamics, and uncertain dynamic input nonlinearities with time-varying uncertain time delays. The proposed control design approach provides a globally stabilizing delay-independent robust adaptive output-feedback dynamic controller based on a dual dynamic high-gain scaling based structure.**

***Index Terms*—Robust adaptive output-feedback control; Time delays; Input unmodeled dynamics; Dynamic scaling. .**

I. Introduction

Consider the following class of uncertain nonlinear systems:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_i &= \phi_{(i,i+1)}(x_1)x_{i+1} + \phi_i(t,x)\ ,\ \ i = 1,\ldots,n-1 \\ \dot{x}_n &= \mu(t,x,\psi,u) \quad ; \quad \dot{\psi} = q_\psi(t,x,\psi,u,x_\Delta,\psi_\Delta,u_\Delta) \\ y &= [x_1, x_n]^T. \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

Here, the strict-feedback-like subsystem with state $x = [x_1,\ldots,x_n]^T$ represents a nominal system and the subsystem with state $\psi \in \mathcal{R}^{n_\psi}$ represents an appended input unmodeled dynamics. $u \in \mathcal{R}$ and $y \in \mathcal{R}^2$ are the control input and measured output, respectively. The subscript Δ is used to denote time delay, i.e., the notations x_Δ, ψ_Δ, and u_Δ refer to the time delayed versions of the signals x, ψ, and u, respectively, i.e., $x(t-\Delta)$, $\psi(t-\Delta)$, and $u(t-\Delta)$. Here, Δ is a (possibly time-varying) time delay[1]. The functions $\phi_{(1,2)},\ldots,\phi_{(n-1,n)}$, are assumed to be known and continuous. $\phi_1,\ldots,\phi_{n-1}$, μ, and q_ψ are uncertain continuous functions.

In (1), the x subsystem can be regarded as a "nominal" system, which if the value of μ could be directly specified by the controller, would be of the form $\dot{x}_i = \phi_{(i,i+1)}(x_1)x_{i+1} + \phi_i(t,x)\ ,\ i = 1,\ldots,n-1; \dot{x}_n = u$. In the actual system (1), the x subsystem is driven by a nonlinear uncertain function μ, representing an input perturbation which involves ψ, which is the unmeasured state of the input unmodeled dynamics, as well as time delays versions of x, ψ, and u. The control objective considered in this paper is to globally (i.e., starting from any initial condition) regulate the signals x and ψ in the system (1) asymptotically to zero under the various uncertainties described above and using measurement of the output y.

Control designs for various structures/classes of nonlinear dynamic systems including parametric and functional uncertainties, input nonlinearities and input unmodeled dynamics, time delays, etc., have been addressed in the literature (e.g., [1]–[20], [36]–[38] and references therein). Scaling based control designs for various types of triangular and non-triangular system structures have been addressed in [14], [21]–[31].

The application of the dynamic scaling technique to systems with uncertain input unmodeled dynamics such as in (1) was considered in [32]–[35]. In [32], [33], nominal feedforward-like systems coupled with nonlinear input uncertainties were considered and a three-time-scale control design was developed that utilized two dynamic scaling parameters (one being essentially analogous to the scaling parameter that was utilized in our prior dual dynamic high-gain scaling based control designs [22] and the second scaling parameter being introduced specifically to handle the dynamic nonlinear input uncertainties). In [35], the three-time scale (i.e., utilizing two dynamic scaling parameters) control design approach was extended to nominal strict-feedback-like systems coupled with nonlinear input uncertainties. In [34], it was shown that (under certain structural conditions of the nominal system and nominal controller) a scaling based control redesign can be introduced to add robustness to input unmodeled dynamics to a general nonlinear system with a given nominal control design. Here, we consider the general class (1) of uncertain systems which includes time delays in the input unmodeled dynamics and we will show that the scaling-based design concept from [32], [35] can be applied to this uncertain system to provide global stabilization with robustness to uncertain input unmodeled dynamics. Specifically, while q_ψ was required to be a function of (t,x,ψ,u) at the current time t in [35], the

To appear in 2017 IEEE International Carpathian Control Conference (ICCC).

[1]To simplify notation, the time argument is omitted when referring to signal values at time t, e.g., $u(t)$ is written simply as u; the time delayed signal values are written as $u_\Delta = u(t-\Delta)$, etc.

control design here addresses the system structure shown in (1) wherein q_ψ involves time-delayed versions of both the state variables and the control input signals. The control design methodology developed in this paper is based on [35] and introduces refinements in the overall control design and the Lyapunov analysis to address the uncertain input unmodeled dynamics with time delays.

II. Notations and Assumptions

Notations: With k being any integer, the notation I_k denotes an identity matrix of dimension $k \times k$. $|a|$ denotes Euclidean norm if a is a column vector, absolute value if a is a scalar, and Euclidean norm of the vector obtained by stacking all the columns of a if a is a (square or non-square) matrix. Given any symmetric positive-definite matrix P, the notations $\lambda_{max}(P)$ and $\lambda_{min}(P)$ denote its maximum and minimum eigenvalues, respectively, of the matrix. If $\alpha : [0, a) \to [0, \infty)$ is a strictly increasing continuous function with $\alpha(0) = 0$, then it is said to belong to class $\mathcal{K}$. If, the class $\mathcal{K}$ definition holds with $a = \infty$ and $\alpha(r) \to \infty$ as $r \to \infty$, then α is said to belong to class $\mathcal{K}_\infty$.

Here, we consider the output-feedback stabilization problem, i.e., only y is assumed to be measured in the system (1). It is assumed that the functions $\phi_i, \phi_{(i,i+1)}, q_\psi$, and μ appearing in the system dynamics satisfy sufficient conditions for local existence and uniqueness of solution trajectories for the system (e.g., local Lipschitz conditions). The control objective in this paper is to make $x(t)$ and $\psi(t)$ in the system (1) asymptotically converge to zero as $t \to \infty$ starting from any initial conditions $x(0) \in \mathcal{R}^n$ and $\psi(0) \in S_\psi$. Here, S_ψ is some known subset (possibly non-compact or unbounded) of $\mathcal{R}^{n_\psi}$. Also, $\overline{S}_\psi$ denotes the set of all possible values of $\psi(t)$ over all time considering the set S_ψ of possible initial values of ψ and the dynamics of the ψ state variables. Here, $\overline{S}_\psi$ could be simply $\mathcal{R}^{n_\psi}$ in general or could be a subset of $\mathcal{R}^{n_\psi}$. The assumptions on the system considered here are given below.

Assumption A1: (lower bound on magnitude of the *upper diagonal* terms $\phi_{(i,i+1)}$) A positive constant σ exists such that $\phi_{(i,i+1)}(x_1) \geq \sigma \ , \ 1 \leq i \leq n-1$ for all $x_1 \in \mathcal{R}$.

Assumption A2: (inequality bound on the uncertain functions ϕ_i) A known continuous function $\Gamma : \mathcal{R} \to \mathcal{R}^+$ and an unknown constant $\theta \geq 0$ exist such that for all $t \geq 0$, $x \in \mathcal{R}^n$, and $1 \leq i \leq n$, the following inequalities hold: $|\phi_i(t,x)| \leq \Gamma(x_1)[\theta|x_1| + \sum_{j=2}^{i} |x_j|]$.

Assumption A3: (cascading dominance of upper diagonal terms) The inequalities $\phi_{(i,i+1)}(x_1) \geq \overline{\rho}_i \phi_{(i-1,i)}(x_1)$ and $\phi_{(i,i+1)}(x_1) \leq \underline{\rho}_i \phi_{(i-1,i)}(x_1)$ are satisfied for all $x_1 \in \mathcal{R}$ and $3 \leq i \leq n-1$ with $\overline{\rho}_i$ and $\underline{\rho}_i$ being positive constants.

Assumption A4: (assumptions on the uncertain nonlinear "input perturbation" function μ) Known non-negative continuous functions $\overline{\mu}(y,u)$, $\overline{\mu}_1(y,u)$, $\overline{\mu}_{1a}(x_1)$, $\tilde{\mu}_1(y,u)$, and $\overline{\mu}_2(y,u)$, non-negative (possibly uncertain) functions $\overline{\mu}_{1\psi}(\psi)$, $\tilde{\mu}_{1\psi}(\psi)$, and $\overline{\mu}_{2\psi}(\psi)$, an uncertain constant θ, and a known constant $\underline{\mu}$ exist such that for all time t, $x \in \mathcal{R}^n$, $\psi \in \overline{S}_\psi$, and $u \in \overline{\mathcal{R}}$: (a) $\frac{\partial}{\partial u}\mu(t,x,\psi,u) \geq \underline{\mu} > 0$; (b) $|\mu(t,x,\psi,u)| \leq \overline{\mu}(y,u)$; (c) $|\frac{\partial \mu(t,x,\psi,u)}{\partial \psi} q_\psi(t,x,\psi,u,x_\Delta,\psi_\Delta,u_\Delta)| \leq \overline{\mu}_1(y,u)\sum_{k=0}^{1}\Big\{\overline{\mu}_{1a}(x_1(t-k\Delta))[\theta|x_1(t-k\Delta)| + \sum_{j=2}^{n}|x_j(t-k\Delta)|] + \overline{\mu}_{1\psi}(\psi(t-k\Delta))\Big\}$; (d) $|\frac{\partial \mu(t,x,\psi,u)}{\partial t}| \leq \tilde{\mu}_1(y,u)[\theta|x_1| + \sum_{j=2}^{n}|x_j| + \tilde{\mu}_{1\psi}(\psi)]$; (e) $|\frac{\partial \mu(t,x,\psi,u)}{\partial x}| \leq \overline{\mu}_2(y,u) + \overline{\mu}_{2\psi}(\psi)$. Also, for all $x \in \mathcal{R}^n$, $t \in \mathcal{R}$, and $\psi \in \overline{S}_\psi$, we have $\lim_{|u|\to\infty} |\mu(t,x,\psi,u)| = \infty$.

Assumption A5: (input-to-state stability – ISS – assumptions on the input unmodeled dynamics, i.e., the ψ subsystem) A Lyapunov function $V_\psi : \mathcal{R}^{n_\psi} \to \mathcal{R}^+$ exists such that for all $t \geq 0$, $x \in \mathcal{R}^n$, $u \in \mathcal{R}$, and $\psi \in \overline{S}_\psi$, the following inequality holds: $\frac{\partial V_\psi}{\partial \psi} q_\psi(t,x,\psi,u,x_\Delta,\psi_\Delta,u_\Delta) \leq -\alpha_\psi(|\psi|) + \sum_{k=0}^{1}\Big\{\Gamma_2(x_1(t-k\Delta))[\theta x_1^2(t-k\Delta) + \sum_{j=2}^{n} x_j^2(t-k\Delta) + \gamma_s(y(t-k\Delta),u(t-k\Delta))]\Big\}$, with α_ψ being a known class $\mathcal{K}_\infty$ function, γ_s and Γ_2 being known non-negative functions, and θ being an unknown non-negative constant. Also, $\gamma_s(y,u) \leq \overline{\gamma}_s(x_1)|\mu(t,x,\psi,u)|^2$ with $\overline{\gamma}_s$ being a known non-negative function. Furthermore, $\alpha_\psi(|\psi|) \geq \underline{V}_\psi V_\psi(\psi)$ and $[\overline{\mu}_{1\psi}^2(\psi) + \tilde{\mu}_{1\psi}^2(\psi) + \overline{\mu}_{2\psi}^2(\psi)] \leq \overline{k}_\psi \alpha_\psi(|\psi|)$ for all $\psi \in \mathcal{R}^{n_\psi}$ with $\underline{V}_\psi$ and $\overline{k}_\psi$ being known positive constants and $\overline{\mu}_{1\psi}$, $\tilde{\mu}_{1\psi}$, and $\overline{\mu}_{2\psi}$ being functions of ψ as in Assumption A4.

Assumption A6: (assumptions on the time delay Δ) The unknown time-varying time delay Δ is uniformly bounded in time and satisfies, for all time, the inequality given by $|\dot{\Delta}| \leq \overline{\Delta} < 1$ with $\dot{\Delta}$ denoting $\frac{d}{dt}\Delta$ and with $\overline{\Delta}$ being a known positive constant.

Theorem 1: Under the Assumptions A1-A6, a positive constant a_θ and continuous functions $g_i, i = 2, \ldots, n$, $k_i, i = 2, \ldots, n$, and nonnegative continuous functions ϑ_1, λ, R, Ω, R_u, Ω_u, and $\overline{Q}_\theta$ can be found such that the dynamic output-feedback controller given below (with $[\hat{x}_2, \ldots, \hat{x}_n, \zeta, r, r_u, \hat{\theta}]^T$ comprising the state of the designed dynamic controller)

$$\left.\begin{array}{rcl} \dot{\hat{x}}_i &=& \phi_{(i,i+1)}(x_1)[\hat{x}_{i+1} + r^i f_{i+1}(x_1)] \\ && -r^{i-1} g_i(x_1)[\hat{x}_2 + r f_2(x_1)] \\ && -(i-1)\dot{r} r^{i-2} f_i(x_1) \ , \ 2 \leq i \leq n-1 \\ \dot{\hat{x}}_n &=& \tilde{u} - r^{n-1} g_n(x_1)[\hat{x}_2 + r f_2(x_1)] \\ && -(n-1)\dot{r} r^{n-2} f_n(x_1) \\ \hat{x} &=& [\hat{x}_2, \ldots, \hat{x}_n]^T \\ f_i(x_1) &=& \int_0^{x_1} \frac{g_i(\pi)}{\phi_{(1,2)}(\pi)} d\pi \ , \ i = 2, \ldots, n \end{array}\right\} \quad (2)$$

$$\left.\begin{array}{l} \varpi_2 = \frac{\hat{x}_2 + r f_2(x_1) + \vartheta(x_1,\hat{\theta})}{r} \\ \varpi_i = \frac{\hat{x}_i + r^{i-1} f_i(x_1)}{r^{i-1}} \ ; \ i = 3, \ldots, n \end{array}\right\} \ ; \ \varpi = [\varpi_2, \ldots, \varpi_n]^T \quad (3)$$

$$\vartheta(x_1, \hat{\theta}) = \hat{\theta} x_1 \vartheta_1(x_1) \quad (4)$$

$$\tilde{u} = -r^n K(x_1)\varpi \ ; \ K(x_1) \stackrel{\triangle}{=} [k_2(x_1), k_3(x_1), \ldots, k_n(x_1)] \quad (5)$$

$$\dot{\zeta} = \dot{r}_u x_n + r_u \tilde{u} \ ; \ u = \zeta - r_u x_n \quad (6)$$

$$\dot{r} = \lambda\Big(R\Big(x_1, \hat{\theta}, \dot{\hat{\theta}}\Big) - r\Big)\Omega(x_1, \hat{\theta}, \dot{\hat{\theta}}, r) \ ; \ r(0) \geq 1 \quad (7)$$

$$\dot{r}_u = \lambda(R_u(y,u,r,\dot{r},\hat{\theta},\dot{\hat{\theta}},\varpi) - r_u) \times \Omega_u(y,u,r,\dot{r},\hat{\theta},\dot{\hat{\theta}},\varpi,r_u) \ ; \ r_u(0) \geq 1 \quad (8)$$

$$\dot{\hat{\theta}} = \overline{Q}_\theta(x_1) \ ; \ \hat{\theta}(0) \geq a_\theta \quad (9)$$

when put in closed loop with the system with dynamics shown in (1) guarantees that for any initial conditions $(x(0), \psi(0), \hat{x}(0),\ \zeta(0), r(0), r_u(0), \hat{\theta}(0)) \in \mathcal{R}^n \times S_\psi \times \mathcal{R}^{n-1} \times \mathcal{R} \times [1,\infty) \times [1,\infty) \times [a_\theta, \infty)$, all the closed-loop signals $(x_1, \ldots, x_n, \psi, \hat{x}_2, \ldots, \hat{x}_n, \zeta, r, r_u, \hat{\theta}, u)$ are uniformly bounded over the time interval $[0,\infty)$ and, furthermore, the signals $x_1, \ldots, x_n, \psi, \hat{x}_2, \ldots, \hat{x}_n$ converge to zero asymptotically as the time t goes to ∞.

Remark 1: Comparing assumptions A1 through A6 given above with the corresponding assumptions in our earlier work [35], it is seen that A1 through A5 are essentially analogous to the assumptions considered before. The additional element in the system structure here is the presence of time delays in the input unmodeled dynamics. The required assumption on this additional element is addressed by Assumption A6. Assumption A6 is equivalent to the standard assumption utilized in the literature on time delayed systems (e.g., [33]) that essentially requires that the time delay value does not change faster than "real-time" (i.e., $|\dot{\Delta}| < dt/dt = 1$). The proposed dynamic controller design approach can be applied to systems that also have time delays in other parts of the system (e.g., in the ϕ_i terms) and multiple time delay values (e.g., state and input time delays in the nominal system dynamics, multiple possible time delay values instead of a single Δ, etc.) by appropriately adding additional terms in the overall system Lyapunov function. However, these additional possible time delays are not considered here so as to focus on the basic control design approach to handle the time delay Δ in the input unmodeled dynamics. $\diamond$

Remark 2: The proposed control design given in Theorem 1 comprises of a reduced-order observer (with state vector $[\hat{x}_2, \ldots, \hat{x}_n]^T$) with dynamics in (2), the nominal control law (5), a dynamic state extension ζ with dynamics as in (6), dynamic scaling parameters r and r_u with dynamics as in (7) and (8), respectively, and an adaptation parameter $\hat{\theta}$ with dynamics as in (9). Here, the dynamic scaling parameters r and r_u are initialized with $r(0) \geq 1$ and $r_u(0) \geq 1$ and the dynamic adaptation parameter $\hat{\theta}$ is initialized with $\hat{\theta}(0) \geq a_\theta > 0$. From the dynamics of these controller state variables, we see that $\dot{r}(t)$, $\dot{r}_u(t)$, and $\dot{\hat{\theta}}(t)$ are non-negative at all time t.It is noteworthy that the overall dynamic controller structure in Theorem 1 is essentially as in [35] and it is seen in Section III that the time delays in the input unmodeled dynamics are handled through changes in the designs of the functions R, Ω, R_u, Ω_u, etc., while retaining the overall controller structure. This is indeed illustrative of the flexibility and generality of the dynamic scaling-based controller design approach that enables (as noted in, for example [26], [34]) control designs for a wide range of classes of systems and uncertainty structures within a unified framework. $\diamond$

Remark 3: Consider the following system with output $y = [x_1, x_4]^T$:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\dot{x}_1 &= (1+x_1^2)x_2 + \theta_1 x_1^2 \cos(x_3) \\
\dot{x}_2 &= (1+x_1+x_1^2)x_3 + \theta_2 x_1^3 \cos(x_2) + x_1^2 x_2 \\
\dot{x}_3 &= (1+2x_1^2)x_4 + \theta_3 x_1^2 + b_1(x_1^3 x_3 + x_1 x_4) \\
\dot{x}_4 &= \mu(t,x,\psi,u) \\
&= a_1(2+\cos(\psi_1))u + a_1 \sin(t) x_1 u^2 \\
&\quad + (a_1+a_2)(2+\sin(x_3)\sin(\psi_2) + x_1^2 + x_4^2)u^3 \\
\dot{\psi}_1 &= \psi_2 - \psi_1 + b_2 x_{1,\Delta} \sin(x_3) + b_3 \cos(t) x_1 x_{1,\Delta}^2 \\
&\quad + b_4 x_{1,\Delta}^2 x_{3,\Delta} \cos(x_{4,\Delta}) + b_5 u \cos(\psi_{1,\Delta}) x_1 \\
\dot{\psi}_2 &= -2\psi_2 + \psi_2 \cos(\psi_{1,\Delta}\psi_{2,\Delta}) + b_6 x_1 x_{2,\Delta} \sin(x_4) \\
&\quad + b_7 x_1 u \cos(u_\Delta)
\end{aligned} \tag{10}
$$

where $x_{i,\Delta}$ and $\psi_{i,\Delta}$ denote $x_i(t-\Delta)$ and $\psi_i(t-\Delta)$, respectively. $\theta_i, i = 1,2,3$, $b_i, i = 1, \ldots, 7$, and $a_i, i = 1,2$, are unknown constants; we assume that upper and lower bounds are known for $a_i, i = 1,2$, as $\overline{a}_i$ and $\underline{a}_i > 0$, respectively. and upper bounds $\overline{b}_i, i = 1, \ldots, 7$ are known for $|b_i|$. Also, an upper bound $\overline{\Delta} < 1$ on $|\dot{\Delta}|$ is considered as known. This sixth-order system can be seen to satisfy the Assumptions A1-A6. The value of σ in Assumption A1 can be picked as $3/4$. The function Γ in Assumption A2 can be chosen to be $\Gamma(x_1) = \max(1, \overline{b}_1)|x_1| + x_1^2 + \overline{b}_1 x_1^3$ and the uncertain parameter θ can be defined as $\theta_a = \max(1, |\theta_1|, |\theta_2|, |\theta_3|)$. With $\overline{\rho}_3 = 0.8$, and $\underline{\rho}_3 = 4$, we see that Assumption A3 is also satisfied. Also, with $\underline{\mu} = \frac{2}{3}\underline{a}_1$, $\overline{\mu}(y,u) = 3\overline{a}_1|u| + \overline{a}_1|x_1|u^2 + (\overline{a}_1+\overline{a}_2)(3+x_1^2+x_4^2)|u|^3$, $\overline{\mu}_1(y,u) = [\overline{a}_1|u| + (\overline{a}_1+\overline{a}_2)|u|^3][1 + \overline{b}_2 + \overline{b}_3|x_1| + \overline{b}_4 + \overline{b}_5|u| + \overline{b}_6|x_1| + \overline{b}_7|u|]$, $\overline{\mu}_{1a}(x_1) = 1 + |x_1| + x_1^2$, $\overline{\mu}_{1\psi}(\psi) = |\psi_1| + 3|\psi_2|$, $\tilde{\mu}_1(y,u) = \overline{a}_1 u^2$, $\tilde{\mu}_{1\psi}(\psi) = 0$, $\overline{\mu}_2(y,u) = \overline{a}_1 u^2 + (\overline{a}_1+\overline{a}_2)(1+2|x_1|+2|x_4|)|u|^3$, $\overline{\mu}_{2\psi}(\psi) = 0$, and with θ appearing in Assumption A4 defined as $\theta_b = 1$, it is seen that Assumption A4 is satisfied. Defining $V_\psi = \frac{1}{2}(\psi_1^2 + \psi_2^2)$, Assumption A5 holds with $\alpha_\psi(|\psi|) = \frac{1}{4}|\psi|^2$, θ given as $\theta_b = 1, \Gamma_2(x_1) = 4(\overline{b}_2^2 + \overline{b}_3^4 x_1^2 + \overline{b}_3^4 x_1^6 + \overline{b}_4^2 x_1^4 + \overline{b}_5^2) + 2(\overline{b}_6^4 x_1^2 + \overline{b}_7^2)$, $\gamma_s(y,u) = (1+x_1^2)^2 u^2$, $\overline{\gamma}_s(x_1) = [4(1+x_1^2)/(3\underline{a}_1)]^2$, $\overline{k}_\psi = 36$, and $\underline{V}_\psi = \frac{1}{2}$. The overall uncertain parameter θ appearing in Assumptions A2 and A5 can be defined as $\theta = \max(\theta_a, \theta_b)$. Therefore, as described above, the example system (10) satisfies the Assumptions A1-A6 and the proposed control design methodology can be applied to this example system. $\diamond$

III. Control Design and Stability Analysis

Choosing $g_i, k_i, i = 2, \ldots, n$**:** Define $D_o = D_c = \text{diag}(1, 2, \ldots, n-1)$ and $\tilde{D}_o = \tilde{D}_c = D_o - \frac{1}{2} I_{n-1}$. Let C be the $1 \times (n-1)$ matrix given as $[1, 0 \ldots, 0]$. Let $A_o(x_1)$ and $A_c(x_1)$ be the square matrices of dimension $(n-1) \times (n-1)$ with $(i,j)^{th}$ elements defined as $A_{o_{(i,i+1)}} = \phi_{(i+1,i+2)}$, $i = 1, \ldots, n-2$, $A_{o_{(i,1)}} = -g_{i+1}$, $i = 1, \ldots, n-1$, $A_{c_{(i,i+1)}} = \phi_{(i+1,i+2)}$, $i = 1, \ldots, n-2$ and $A_{c_{(n,j)}} = -k_{j+1}$, $j = 1, \ldots, n-1$, and with all other elements being zero. Given Assumptions A1 and A3, we know ([23], [39], [40]) that constant $(n-1) \times (n-1)$ matrices $P_o > 0$ and $P_c > 0$, positive constants ν_o, $\tilde{\nu}_o$ $\underline{\nu}_o$, $\overline{\nu}_o$, ν_c, $\underline{\nu}_c$, and $\overline{\nu}_c$, and functions $g_2, \ldots, g_n$,$k_2, \ldots, k_n$ can be constructed such that the following two pairs of coupled Lyapunov inequalities are satisfied for all $x_1 \in \mathcal{R}$:

$$
P_o A_o(x_1) + A_o^T(x_1) P_o \leq -\nu_o I_{n-1} - \tilde{\nu}_o \phi_{(2,3)}(x_1) C^T C
$$

$$\underline{\nu}_o I_{n-1} \leq P_o \tilde{D}_o + \tilde{D}_o P_o \leq \overline{\nu}_o I_{n-1} \quad (11)$$

$$P_c A_c(x_1) + A_c^T(x_1) P_c \leq -\nu_c \phi_{(2,3)}(x_1) I_{n-1}$$
$$\underline{\nu}_c I_{n-1} \leq P_c \tilde{D}_c + \tilde{D}_c P_c \leq \overline{\nu}_c I_{n-1}. \quad (12)$$

The first of these pairs (11) can be considered the *observer-context* coupled Lyapunov inequalities that relates to the choice of the functions (*observer gain functions*) $g_2, \ldots, g_n$ while the second of these pairs (12) can be considered the *controller-context* coupled Lyapunov inequalities that relates to the choice of the functions (*controller gain functions*) $k_2, \ldots, k_n$. Also, the functions $g_2, \ldots, g_n$ can be chosen ([23], [39], [40]) such that $\sqrt{\sum_{i=2}^{n} g_i^2(x_1)} \leq \overline{g}\phi_{(2,3)}(x_1)$ for all $x_1 \in \mathcal{R}$ with $\overline{g}$ being a positive constant.

Scaled observer errors ϵ_i and their dynamics: As noted in Remark 2, the dynamics (2) can be viewed as a reduced-order observer with state variables $\hat{x} = [\hat{x}_2, \ldots, \hat{x}_n]^T$. Define the observer error vector $e = [e_2, \ldots, e_n]^T$ and the scaled observer error vector $\epsilon = [\epsilon_2, \ldots, \epsilon_n]^T$ as $e_i = \hat{x}_i + r^{i-1} f_i(x_1) - x_i$, $i = 2, \ldots, n$ and $\epsilon_i = \frac{e_i}{r^{i-1}}$, $i = 2, \ldots, n$. Then, we have the dynamics

$$\dot{\epsilon} = rA_o\epsilon - \frac{\dot{r}}{r} D_o \epsilon + \overline{\Phi} - B\frac{u_d}{r^{n-1}} \quad ; \quad u_d \triangleq \mu(t,x,\psi,u) - \tilde{u} \quad (13)$$

where $B \in \mathcal{R}^{n-1} = [0, \ldots, 0, 1]^T$, and $\overline{\Phi} = [\overline{\Phi}_2, \ldots, \overline{\Phi}_n]^T$ with $\overline{\Phi}_i = -\frac{\phi_i}{r^{i-1}} + g_i \frac{\phi_1}{\phi_{(1,2)}}$. The quantities ϖ_i in (3) can be viewed as scaled observer estimates with dynamics given by $\dot{\varpi} = rA_c\varpi - \frac{\dot{r}}{r} D_c \varpi - rG\epsilon_2 + G\frac{\phi_1}{\phi_{(1,2)}} + B_1\Psi$ where $G = [g_2, \ldots, g_n]^T$, $B_1 \in \mathcal{R}^{n-1}$ is given as $[1, 0, \ldots, 0]^T$, and $\Psi = \frac{\partial \vartheta}{\partial x_1}\phi_{(1,2)}(x_1)(\varpi_2 - \epsilon_2) + \frac{1}{r}\frac{\partial \vartheta}{\partial x_1}[\phi_1 - \phi_{(1,2)}\vartheta] + \frac{1}{r}\frac{\partial \vartheta}{\partial \hat{\theta}}\dot{\hat{\theta}}$. From (4), we have $\frac{\partial \vartheta}{\partial \theta} = x_1\vartheta_1(x_1)$ and $\frac{\partial \vartheta}{\partial x_1} = \hat{\theta}(\vartheta_1(x_1) + x_1\vartheta_1'(x_1))$ where the notation $\vartheta_1'(x_1)$ is used to represent $\frac{d\vartheta_1(\pi)}{d\pi}\Big|_{\pi = x_1}$.

Observer Lyapunov function V_o, controller Lyapunov function V_c, and composite Lyapunov function V_x: The observer and controller Lyapunov functions are defined as $V_o = r\epsilon^T P_o \epsilon$ and $V_c = r\varpi^T P_c \varpi + \frac{1}{2}\left(1 + \frac{1}{r}\right) x_1^2$ and a composite Lyapunov function is defined as the linear combination $V_x = cV_o + V_c$ where $c > 0$ is any constant such that $c > [4\lambda_{max}^2(P_c)\overline{g}^2/(\tilde{\nu}_o\nu_c)]$. Using (11) and (12), it can be shown that

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{V}_x \leq & -r^2\frac{c\nu_o}{4}|\epsilon|^2 - r^2\frac{\nu_c}{4}\phi_{(2,3)}(x_1)|\varpi|^2 - \dot{r}c\underline{\nu}_o|\epsilon|^2 - \dot{r}\underline{\nu}_c|\varpi|^2 \\ & - x_1\phi_{(1,2)}\vartheta - \frac{1}{2}\frac{\dot{r}}{r^2}x_1^2 - \frac{2cr\epsilon^T P_o B u_d}{r^{n-1}} \\ & + rw_1(x_1, \hat{\theta}, \dot{\hat{\theta}})[|\epsilon|^2 + |\varpi|^2] + q_1(x_1)x_1^2 + \theta^* q_2(x_1)x_1^2 \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where $\theta^* = \theta + \theta^2$, $q_1(x_1) = \frac{4}{c\nu_o}\phi_{(1,2)}^2(x_1) + \frac{8}{\nu_c\phi_{(2,3)}(x_1)}\phi_{(1,2)}^2(x_1) + \lambda_{max}^2(P_c) + 2$, $q_2(x_1) = 2\Gamma(x_1) + 1 + \frac{8\lambda_{max}^2(P_c)\overline{g}^2\phi_{(2,3)}(x_1)}{\nu_c}\frac{\Gamma^2(x_1)}{\phi_{(1,2)}^2(x_1)} + \frac{8n}{c\nu_o}\lambda_{max}^2(P_o)\Gamma^2(x_1)\Big[1 + \overline{g}^2\phi_{(2,3)}^2(x_1)/\phi_{(1,2)}^2(x_1)\Big]$, and $w_1(x_1, \hat{\theta}, \dot{\hat{\theta}}) = 3\lambda_{max}(P_c)\Big|\frac{\partial \vartheta(x_1, \hat{\theta})}{\partial x_1}\Big|\phi_{(1,2)}(x_1) + \vartheta_1^2(x_1)\dot{\hat{\theta}}^2 + \lambda_{max}^2(P_c)\hat{\theta}^2(\vartheta_1(x_1) + \vartheta_1'(x_1)x_1)^2(\Gamma^2(x_1) + \phi_{(1,2)}^2(x_1)\vartheta_1^2(x_1)) + 3\lambda_{max}(P_o)(n + n^2)\Gamma(x_1) + n\lambda_{max}^2 P_o\hat{\theta}^2\vartheta_1^2(x_1)$.

Remark 4: The nominal x subsystem can be seen to be globally stabilized if the virtual "control input" entering into the subsystem could be made to be $\tilde{u}$ instead of $\mu(t,x,\psi,u)$. Hence, $u_d = [\mu(t,x,\psi,u) - \tilde{u}]$ can be viewed as a "mismatch" term due to the fact that the actual control signal entering into the x subsystem is $\mu(t,x,\psi,u)$ instead of the desired virtual control input $\tilde{u}$. It will be seen in the analysis below that the control "redesign" given by the dynamic state extension ζ and control input (u) definition in (6) along with the designs of dynamics of the scaling parameters r and r_u will make $\mu(t,x,\psi,u)$ track the desired/nominal control input signal $\tilde{u}$, thus making the actual system (1) with the input unmodeled dynamics globally stabilized with asymptotic convergence of x and ψ. $\diamond$

Mismatch term $u_d = [\mu(t,x,\psi,u) - \tilde{u}]$ and Lyapunov function component V_u: We see from (6) that:

$$\dot{u} = \dot{\zeta} - \dot{r}_u x_n - r_u \dot{x}_n = -r_u[\mu(t,x,\psi,u) - \tilde{u}] = -r_u u_d. \quad (15)$$

Hence,

$$\dot{u}_d = -r_u\frac{\partial \mu(t,x,\psi,u)}{\partial u}u_d + \frac{\partial \mu(t,x,\psi,u)}{\partial x_n}u_d + \chi_1 \quad (16)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\chi_1 = & \frac{\partial \mu(t,x,\psi,u)}{\partial x_1}[\phi_{(1,2)}(x_1)x_2 + \phi_1(t,x)] \\ & + \frac{\partial \mu(t,x,\psi,u)}{\partial x_n}\tilde{u} + nr^{n-1}\dot{r}K(x_1)\varpi \\ & + \sum_{i=2}^{n-1}\frac{\partial \mu(t,x,\psi,u)}{\partial x_i}[\phi_{(i,i+1)}(x_1)x_{i+1} + \phi_i(t,x)] \\ & + \frac{\partial \mu(t,x,\psi,u)}{\partial \psi}q_\psi(t,x,\psi,u,x_\Delta,\psi_\Delta,u_\Delta) \\ & + \frac{\partial \mu(t,x,\psi,u)}{\partial t} + r^n\frac{\partial K}{\partial x_1}\varpi[\phi_{(1,2)}(x_1)x_2 + \phi_1(t,x)] \\ & + r^n K(x_1)\dot{\varpi}. \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

Here, $\frac{\partial \mu(t,x,\psi,u)}{\partial x_i}$ denotes $\frac{\partial \mu(t,x,\psi,u)}{\partial x}\varrho_i$ where ϱ_i is a vector of dimension $n \times 1$ having 1 as its i^{th} element and having 0's everywhere else. The quantity χ_1 can be shown to satisfy the magnitude bound $|\chi_1| \leq \beta_1(y,u,r,\dot{r},\hat{\theta})[|\epsilon| + |\varpi|] + \beta_2(y,u,r,\hat{\theta},\dot{\hat{\theta}})|x_1| + \theta\beta_3(y,u,r)|x_1| + \overline{\mu}_{2\psi}(\psi)\Big\{r^n\beta_4(x_1)[|\epsilon| + |\varpi|] + \beta_5(x_1,\hat{\theta})|x_1| + \theta\beta_6(x_1)|x_1|\Big\} + r^{n+1}\beta_7(x_1)[|\epsilon|^2 + |\varpi|^2] + r^n\beta_8(x_1)\theta|\varpi||x_1| + \Big|\frac{\partial \mu(t,x,\psi,u)}{\partial \psi}q_\psi(t,x,\psi,u,x_\Delta,\psi_\Delta,u_\Delta)\Big| + \Big|\frac{\partial \mu(t,x,\psi,u)}{\partial t}\Big|$ with

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_1(y,u,r,\dot{r},\hat{\theta}) = & \overline{\mu}_2(y,u)\{r\phi_{(1,2)}(x_1) + r^n|K(x_1)| \\ & + \sum_{j=2}^{n-1}\phi_{(i,i+1)}(x_1)r^i + r^{n-1}n^{\frac{3}{2}}\Gamma(x_1)\}\end{aligned}$$

$$+ nr^{n-1}\dot{r}|K(x_1)| + r^{n-1}\dot{r}|K(x_1)||D_c| + r^n\left|\frac{\partial K(x_1)}{\partial x_1}\right||\hat{\theta}\vartheta_1(x_1)x_1|\phi_{(1,2)}(x_1) + r^{n+1}|K(x_1)||A_c(x_1)| + r^{n+1}|K(x_1)||G(x_1)| + r^n|K(x_1)|\hat{\theta}|\vartheta_1(x_1) + \vartheta_1'(x_1)x_1|\phi_{(1,2)}(x_1), \quad (18)$$

$\beta_2(y,u,r,\hat{\theta},\dot{\hat{\theta}}) = \overline{\mu}_2(y,u)\hat{\theta}\vartheta_1(x_1)\{\phi_{(1,2)}(x_1) + n\Gamma(x_1)\} + r^{n-1}|K(x_1)|\hat{\theta}^2(|\vartheta_1(x_1) + \vartheta_1'(x_1)x_1|)\phi_{(1,2)}(x_1)|\vartheta_1(x_1)| + r^{n-1}|K(x_1)||\dot{\hat{\theta}}\vartheta_1(x_1)|$, $\beta_3(y,u,r) = (n+1)\overline{\mu}_2(y,u)\Gamma(x_1) + r^n\frac{|K(x_1)||G(x_1)|}{\phi_{(1,2)}(x_1)}\Gamma(x_1) + r^{n-1}|K(x_1)|\hat{\theta}|\vartheta_1(x_1) + \vartheta_1'(x_1)x_1|\Gamma(x_1)$, $\beta_4(x_1) = \phi_{(1,2)}(x_1) + |K(x_1)| + \sum_{j=2}^{n-1}\phi_{(i,i+1)}(x_1) + n^{\frac{3}{2}}\Gamma(x_1)$, $\beta_5(x_1,\hat{\theta}) = \phi_{(1,2)}(x_1)\hat{\theta}\vartheta_1(x_1) + n\Gamma(x_1)\hat{\theta}\vartheta_1(x_1)$, $\beta_6(x_1) = (n+1)\Gamma(x_1)$, $\beta_7(x_1) = \frac{3}{2}\left|\frac{\partial K(x_1)}{\partial x_1}\right|\phi_{(1,2)}(x_1)$, and $\beta_8(x_1) = \left|\frac{\partial K(x_1)}{\partial x_1}\right|\Gamma(x_1)$.

Define

$$V_u = \frac{1}{2r^n\Pi(r_u)}\ln(1+u_d^2) \quad (19)$$

where $\ln$ denotes log_e; Π is any function from $\mathcal{R}^+$ to $\mathcal{R}^+$ such that the following properties are satisfied: $\Pi(a) \geq 1$ whenever $a \geq 1$; $\Pi(a)$ is a continuously differentiable and monotonically increasing function over the interval $[1,\infty)$; a constant $\overline{\Pi} > 0$ exists such that $\Pi(a) \leq \overline{\Pi}$ for all $a \in [1,\infty)$. We utilize $\Pi'(r_u)$ to denote $\frac{\partial\Pi(r_u)}{\partial r_u}$. An example of a function that satisfies the above properties is $\Pi(a) = \tanh(ka) + 1$ with any constant $k > 0$. V_u satisfies:

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{V}_u \leq & -r_u\underline{\mu}\frac{u_d^2}{(1+u_d^2)r^n\Pi(r_u)} - \left(\frac{\Pi'(r_u)\dot{r}_u}{\Pi(r_u)} + \frac{n\dot{r}}{r}\right)\frac{\ln(1+u_d^2)}{2\Pi(r_u)r^n} + k_{\psi 1}\frac{\alpha_\psi(\psi)}{r^{2n-\frac{3}{2}}} + \frac{\Xi_{u1}(y,u,r,\dot{r},\hat{\theta},\dot{\hat{\theta}})}{\Pi(r_u)}\frac{u_d^2}{1+u_d^2} \\ & + r\tilde{w}_1(x_1)[|\epsilon|^2 + |\varpi|^2] + \frac{1}{r}\tilde{q}_1(x_1,\hat{\theta})x_1^2 + \frac{1}{r}\theta^*\tilde{q}_2(x_1)x_1^2 + \frac{1}{r}\Big[c_3\theta^2 + c_2\hat{\theta}_\Delta^2\vartheta_1^2(x_{1,\Delta})\Big]\overline{\mu}_{1a}^2(x_{1,\Delta})x_{1,\Delta}^2 \\ & + \frac{c_{\psi 1}}{2r^{2n-\frac{3}{2}}}\overline{\mu}_{1\psi}^2(\psi_\Delta) + \frac{c_1}{r^{2n-3}}\sum_{j=1}^{n} r_\Delta^{2j-2}(\varpi_{j,\Delta}^2 + \epsilon_{j,\Delta}^2)\overline{\mu}_{1a}^2(x_{1,\Delta}) \quad (20)\end{aligned}$$

where r_Δ, $\hat{\theta}_\Delta$, $x_{1,\Delta}$, $\varpi_{j,\Delta}$, $\epsilon_{j,\Delta}$, and ψ_Δ denote the time-delayed versions (with time delay Δ) of the corresponding signals (e.g., $x_{1,\Delta}(t) = x_1(t-\Delta)$, $\epsilon_{j,\Delta}(t) = \epsilon_j(t-\Delta)$). Also, $\tilde{w}_1(x_1) = c_1(1+\overline{\mu}_{1a}^2(x_1)) + \beta_7(x_1) + \frac{\beta_4^2(x_1)}{c_{\psi 2}} + \frac{\beta_8^2(x_1)}{2c_4}$, $\tilde{q}_1(x_1,\hat{\theta}) = c_2(1+\hat{\theta}^2\vartheta_1^2(x_1)\overline{\mu}_{1a}^2(x_1)) + \frac{\beta_5^2(x_1,\hat{\theta})}{2c_{\psi 2}}$, $\tilde{q}_2(x_1) = c_3(1+\overline{\mu}_{1a}^2(x_1)) + \frac{\beta_6^2(x_1)}{2c_{\psi 2}} + \frac{c_4}{2}$, $k_{\psi 1} = 0.5(c_{\psi 1} + 3c_{\psi 2})\overline{k}_\psi$, and

$$\Xi_{u1}(y,u,r,\dot{r},\hat{\theta},\dot{\hat{\theta}}) = \frac{\overline{\mu}_2(y,u)}{r^n} + \frac{1}{2c_{\psi_1}r^{\frac{3}{2}}} + \frac{\beta_1^2(y,u,r,\dot{r},\hat{\theta})}{2c_1r^{2n+1}} + \frac{1}{c_{\psi 1}}\frac{\tilde{\overline{\mu}}_1^2(y,u)}{r^{\frac{3}{2}}} + \frac{1}{4c_2}\frac{\beta_2^2(y,u,r,\hat{\theta},\dot{\hat{\theta}})}{r^{2n-1}} + \frac{1}{4c_3}\frac{\beta_3^2(y,u,r)}{r^{2n-1}} + \left[\frac{1}{2c_3r^{2n-1}} + \frac{n}{c_1r^3} + \frac{1}{2c_2r^{2n-1}}\right]\tilde{\overline{\mu}}_1^2(y,u) \quad (21)$$

where $c_1,\ldots,c_4$, $c_{\psi 1}$, and $c_{\psi 2}$ are any positive constants and $\tilde{\overline{\mu}}_1(y,u)$ is defined as $[\overline{\mu}_1(y,u) + \tilde{\mu}_1(y,u)]$. Since we have the upper bound $|u_d| \leq \overline{u}_d(y,u,r,\varpi)$ where $\overline{u}_d(y,u,r,\varpi)$ is defined as $\overline{u}_d(y,u,r,\varpi) \triangleq \Big[\overline{\mu}(y,u) + r^n|K(x_1)||\varpi|\Big]$, the following inequality can be written for the term involving u_d in (14): $-\frac{2cr\epsilon^T P_o B u_d}{r^{n-1}} \leq r\lambda_{max}^2(P_o)c^2|\epsilon|^2 + \frac{1}{r^{2n-3}}[1 + \overline{u}_d^2(y,u,r,\varpi)]\ln(1+u_d^2)$. Note that $\overline{u}_d(y,u,r,\varpi)$ is a completely known function and involves only available variables.

Scaling of Lyapunov function for ψ subsystem: Defining $\tilde{V}_\psi = \frac{V_\psi}{r^{2n-\frac{3}{2}}}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\tilde{V}}_\psi \leq & -\frac{\alpha_\psi(|\psi|)}{r^{2n-\frac{3}{2}}} + \sum_{k=0}^{1}\Gamma_2(x_{1,k\Delta})\Big\{\theta x_{1,k\Delta}^2 + 3[|\varpi_{k\Delta}|^2 + |\epsilon_{k\Delta}|^2] + \frac{3}{r_{k\Delta}^{\frac{1}{2}}}\hat{\theta}_{k\Delta}^2\vartheta_1^2(x_{1,k\Delta})x_{1,k\Delta}^2 \\ & + 2\frac{\overline{\gamma}_s(x_{1,k\Delta})}{r_{k\Delta}^{2n-\frac{3}{2}}}u_{d,k\Delta}^2 + 2r_{k\Delta}^{\frac{3}{2}}\overline{\gamma}_s(x_{1,k\Delta})|K(x_{1,k\Delta})|^2|\varpi_{k\Delta}|^2\Big\} \quad (22)\end{aligned}$$

Overall composite Lyapunov function V including terms to handle time-delayed terms in $\dot{V}_u$ and $\dot{\tilde{V}}_\psi$: Define

$$\begin{aligned}V = & V_x + c_\psi\tilde{V}_\psi + c_uV_u + \frac{1}{2c_\theta}(\hat{\theta}-\theta^*)^2 + \frac{1}{1-\overline{\Delta}}\int_{t-\Delta}^{t}\Big\{c_\psi\Gamma_2(x_1(\pi))\Big\{\theta x_1^2(\pi) + 3[|\varpi(\pi)|^2 + |\epsilon(\pi)|^2] + \frac{3}{r^{\frac{1}{2}}(\pi)}\hat{\theta}^2(\pi)\vartheta_1^2(x_1(\pi))x_1^2(\pi) \\ & + 2r^{\frac{3}{2}}(\pi)\overline{\gamma}_s(x_1(\pi))|K(x_1(\pi))|^2|\varpi(\pi)|^2 + 2\frac{\overline{\gamma}_s(x_1(\pi))}{r^{2n-\frac{3}{2}}(\pi)}u_d^2(\pi)\Big\} + \frac{c_u}{r(\pi)}\Big[c_3\theta^2 + c_2\hat{\theta}^2(\pi)\vartheta_1^2(x_1(\pi))\Big]\overline{\mu}_{1a}^2(x_1(\pi))x_1^2(\pi) \\ & + \frac{c_uc_1}{r^{2n-3}(\pi)}\sum_{j=1}^{n}r^{2j-2}(\pi)(\varpi_j^2(\pi) + \epsilon_j^2(\pi))\overline{\mu}_{1a}^2(x_1(\pi)) + \frac{c_uc_{\psi 1}}{2r^{2n-\frac{3}{2}}(\pi)}\overline{\mu}_{1\psi}^2(\psi(\pi))\Big\}d\pi \quad (23)\end{aligned}$$

with c_u, c_θ, and c_ψ being any positive constants with furthermore c_ψ additionally satisfying $c_\psi \geq c_u[2k_{\psi 1} + \tilde{\Delta}c_{\psi 1}\overline{k}_\psi]$. Hence, using (20) and (22), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{V} \leq & -r^2\frac{c\nu_o}{4}|\epsilon|^2 - r^2\frac{\nu_c}{4}\phi_{(2,3)}(x_1)|\varpi|^2 - \dot{r}c\underline{\nu}_o|\epsilon|^2 - \dot{r}\underline{\nu}_c|\varpi|^2 - x_1\phi_{(1,2)}\vartheta - \frac{1}{2}\frac{\dot{r}}{r^2}x_1^2 - \frac{c_\psi\alpha_\psi(|\psi|)}{2r^{2n-\frac{3}{2}}} \\ & - c_ur_u\underline{\mu}\frac{u_d^2}{(1+u_d^2)r^n\Pi(r_u)} - c_u\frac{\Pi'(r_u)\dot{r}_u}{2\Pi^2(r_u)r^n}\ln(1+u_d^2)\end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&- c_u \frac{n\dot{r}}{2r^{n+1}\Pi(r_u)} \ln(1+u_d^2) \\
&+ \frac{1}{c_\theta}(\hat{\theta}-\theta^*)\dot{\hat{\theta}} + r\overline{w}_1(x_1,\hat{\theta},\dot{\hat{\theta}})[|\epsilon|^2+|\varpi|^2] \\
&+ r^{\frac{3}{2}}\overline{w}_2(x_1)[|\epsilon|^2+|\varpi|^2] + \overline{q}_1(x_1)x_1^2 + \theta^*\overline{q}_2(x_1)x_1^2 \\
&+ \frac{\overline{q}_3(x_1,\hat{\theta})\vartheta_1^2(x_1)x_1^2}{r^{\frac{1}{2}}} + \frac{\overline{q}_4(x_1,\hat{\theta})}{r}x_1^2 + \theta^*\frac{\overline{q}_5(x_1)}{r}x_1^2 \\
&+ \frac{\overline{\Xi}_{u1}(y,u,r,\dot{r},\hat{\theta},\dot{\hat{\theta}})}{\Pi(r_u)}\frac{u_d^2}{1+u_d^2} \\
&+ \overline{\Xi}_{u2}(y,u,r,\varpi)\ln(1+u_d^2)
\end{aligned} \tag{24}
$$

where $\overline{w}_1(x_1,\hat{\theta},\dot{\hat{\theta}}) = w_1(x_1,\hat{\theta},\dot{\hat{\theta}}) + \lambda_{max}^2(P_o)c^2 + c_u[\tilde{w}_1(x_1) + c_1\tilde{\Delta}\overline{\mu}_{1a}^2(x_1)] + 3\tilde{c}_\psi\Gamma_2(x_1)$, $\overline{w}_2(x_1) = 2\tilde{c}_\psi\overline{\gamma}_s(x_1)\Gamma_2(x_1)|K(x_1)|^2$, $\overline{\Xi}_{u1}(y,u,r,\dot{r},\hat{\theta},\dot{\hat{\theta}}) = c_u\Xi_{u1}(y,u,r,\dot{r},\hat{\theta},\dot{\hat{\theta}})$, $\overline{\Xi}_{u2}(y,u,r,\varpi) = \Big[\frac{1}{r^{2n-3}} + 2\tilde{c}_\psi\Gamma_2(x_1)\frac{\overline{\gamma}_s(x_1)}{r^{2n-\frac{3}{2}}}\Big][1+\overline{u}_d^2(y,u,r,\varpi)]$, $\overline{q}_1(x_1) = q_1(x_1)$, $\overline{q}_2(x_1) = q_2(x_1) + \tilde{c}_\psi\Gamma_2(x_1)$, $\overline{q}_3(x_1,\hat{\theta}) = 3\tilde{c}_\psi\Gamma_2(x_1)\hat{\theta}^2$, $\overline{q}_4(x_1,\hat{\theta}) = c_u[\tilde{q}_1(x_1,\hat{\theta}) + c_2\tilde{\Delta}\hat{\theta}^2\vartheta_1^2(x_1)\overline{\mu}_{1a}^2(x_1)]$, and $\overline{q}_5(x_1) = c_u[\tilde{q}_2(x_1) + c_3\tilde{\Delta}\overline{\mu}_{1a}^2(x_1)]$, $\tilde{c}_\psi = c_\psi\frac{2-\underline{\Delta}}{1-\underline{\Delta}}$, and $\tilde{\Delta} = \frac{1}{1-\underline{\Delta}}$.

Design of function ϑ_1 appearing in (4): The function $\vartheta_1(x_1)$ is chosen as $\vartheta_1(x_1) = \frac{4}{\phi_{(1,2)}(x_1)}\Big(\frac{\overline{q}_1(x_1)+\vartheta_1^*}{a_\theta} + \overline{q}_2(x_1)\Big)$ with ϑ_1^* being any positive constant.

Design of function $\overline{Q}_\theta$ appearing in dynamics of $\hat{\theta}$ in (9): $\overline{Q}_\theta(x_1) = c_\theta\Big(\overline{q}_2(x_1) + \frac{\overline{q}_5(x_1)}{r}\Big)x_1^2$.

Design of functions λ, R, Ω, R_u, and Ω_u appearing in dynamics of scaling parameters in (7) and (8): $\lambda:\mathcal{R}\to\mathcal{R}^+$ is chosen to be any continuous function such that $\lambda(s)=1$ for any $s>0$ and $\lambda(s)=0$ for any $s<-\epsilon_r$ with $\epsilon_r>0$ being any constant. The functions R and Ω are chosen as shown in (25) and (26), respectively, with $\overline{R}$ and $\overline{\Omega}$ being any nonnegative constants and with $\nu_a = \max\Big(\frac{1}{c\nu_o}, \frac{1}{\nu_c\sigma}\Big)$ and $\nu_b = \max\Big(\frac{1}{c\underline{\nu}_o}, \frac{1}{\underline{\nu}_c}\Big)$. R_u and Ω_u are chosen as shown in (27) and (28), respectively, where $\overline{R}_u$ and $\overline{\Omega}_u$ are any nonnegative constants and ν_u is any positive constant.

Analysis of closed-loop stability and asymptotic convergence: There are two possible cases: (i) $r \geq R(x_1,\hat{\theta},\dot{\hat{\theta}})$; (ii) $r < R(x_1,\hat{\theta},\dot{\hat{\theta}})$. In case (i), we have $r \geq R(x_1,\hat{\theta},\dot{\hat{\theta}})$, and in case (ii), we have $\dot{r} = \Omega(x_1,\hat{\theta},\dot{\hat{\theta}},r)$. In either of these cases, i.e., at all time instants t, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\dot{V} \leq& -r^2\frac{c\nu_o}{8}|\epsilon|^2 - r^2\frac{\nu_c}{8}\phi_{(2,3)}(x_1)|\varpi|^2 - \vartheta_1^* x_1^2 - \frac{c_\psi\alpha_\psi(|\psi|)}{2r^{2n-\frac{3}{2}}} \\
&- c_u r_u\underline{\mu}\frac{u_d^2}{(1+u_d^2)r^n\Pi(r_u)} - c_u\frac{\Pi'(r_u)\dot{r}_u}{2\Pi^2(r_u)r^n}\ln(1+u_d^2) \\
&+ \frac{\overline{\Xi}_{u1}(y,u,r,\dot{r},\hat{\theta},\dot{\hat{\theta}})}{\Pi(r_u)}\frac{u_d^2}{1+u_d^2} + \overline{\Xi}_{u2}(y,u,r,\varpi)\ln(1+u_d^2)
\end{aligned} \tag{29}
$$

Now, similarly, there are two possible cases for r_u: (A) $r_u \geq R_u$; (B) $r_u < R_u$. In case (A), we have $r_u \geq R_u$, and in case (B), we have $\dot{r}_u = \Omega_u$. It can be shown that in either of cases (A) and (B), i.e., at all time instants t,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\dot{V} \leq& -r^2\frac{c\nu_o}{8}|\epsilon|^2 - r^2\frac{\nu_c}{8}\phi_{(2,3)}(x_1)|\varpi|^2 - \vartheta_1^* x_1^2 \\
&- \frac{c_\psi\underline{V}_\psi}{2}\tilde{V}_\psi(\psi) - \nu_u\ln(1+u_d^2).
\end{aligned} \tag{30}
$$

From (30) and the system dynamics, the closed-loop stability and asymptotic convergence properties can be inferred. Firstly, to show that solutions exist for all time, consider the maximal interval of existence of solutions of the closed-loop dynamic system to be $[0,t_f)$ with some $t_f>0$. Then, from (30), it can be seen that V is bounded on $[0,t_f)$ and that therefore, from the definition of V and the dynamics of the closed-loop system, a process of signal chasing can be used to show that all closed-loop signals remain bounded on $[0,t_f)$. Therefore, solutions exist for all time, i.e., $t_f=\infty$. Also, from (30), ϵ, ϖ, x_1, ψ, and u_d, and therefore, $x_1,\ldots,x_n,\psi,\hat{x}_2,\ldots,\hat{x}_n$ go to zero asymptotically as $t\to\infty$.

IV. Conclusion

We considered a general class of uncertain nonlinear systems with input unmodeled dynamics with time-varying time delays and showed that a dynamic scaling based robust adaptive output-feedback controller can be designed to globally stabilize this uncertain nonlinear system. While the input unmodeled dynamics subsystem involves uncertain (and time-varying) time delays both on the state and control input signals entering into this subsystem, the developed control design methodology is itself delay-independent in two important senses: firstly, the controller does not utilize any delayed versions of the measured output, input, or controller internal variable signals; secondly, the control design does not require knowledge of the actual time delay magnitudes (specifically, only requires an upper bound on rate of change of the time delay magnitude). In further research, applicability of the proposed techniques to more general classes of nonlinear systems (e.g., nontriangular systems, more general structures of appended dynamics, etc.) are being considered.

References

[1] M. Krstić, I. Kanellakopoulos, and P. V. Kokotović, *Nonlinear and Adaptive Control Design*. New York: Wiley, 1995.

[2] A. Isidori, *Nonlinear Control Systems II*. London, UK: Springer, 1999.

[3] H. Khalil, *Nonlinear Systems*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 2001.

[4] L. Praly and Y. Wang, "Stabilization in spite of matched unmodeled dynamics and an equivalent definition of input-to-state stability," *Math. of Control, Signals and Systems*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 1-33, 1996.

[5] R. Sepulchre, M. Janković, and P. Kokotović, *Constructive Nonlinear Control*. London, UK: Springer Verlag, 1997.

[6] B. Ren, S. S. Ge, T. H. Lee, and C.-Y. Su, "Adaptive neural control for uncertain nonlinear systems in pure-feedback form with hysteresis input," in *Proc. of the IEEE Conf. on Decision and Control*, Cancun, Mexico, Dec. 2008, pp. 86–91.

[7] M. Jankovic, "Stabilization of nonlinear time delay systems with delay-independent feedback," in *Proc. of the American Control Conference*, Portland, OR, June 2005, pp. 4253–4258.

[8] F. Mazenc and P.-A. Bliman, "Backstepping design for time-delay nonlinear systems," *IEEE Trans. on Automatic Control*, vol. 51, no. 1, pp. 149–154, Jan. 2006.

$$R(x_1,\hat{\theta},\dot{\hat{\theta}}) = \max\left(\overline{R}, 16\nu_a\overline{w}_1(x_1,\hat{\theta},\dot{\hat{\theta}}), (16\nu_a\overline{w}_2(x_1))^2, \left(\frac{4\overline{q}_3(x_1,\hat{\theta})\vartheta_1(x_1)}{\hat{\theta}\phi_{(1,2)}(x_1)}\right)^2, \frac{4(\overline{q}_4(x_1,\hat{\theta})+\hat{\theta}\overline{q}_5(x_1))}{\hat{\theta}\phi_{(1,2)}(x_1)\vartheta_1(x_1)}\right) \tag{25}$$

$$\Omega(x_1,\hat{\theta},\dot{\hat{\theta}},r) = \max\left(\overline{\Omega}, 2\nu_b r\overline{w}_1(x_1,\hat{\theta},\dot{\hat{\theta}}), 2\nu_b r^{\frac{3}{2}}\overline{w}_2(x_1), 2\Big(\overline{q}_3(x_1,\hat{\theta})\vartheta_1^2(x_1)r^{\frac{3}{2}} + r\overline{q}_4(x_1,\hat{\theta}) + \hat{\theta}r\overline{q}_5(x_1)\Big)\right) \tag{26}$$

$$R_u(y,u,r,\dot{r},\hat{\theta},\dot{\hat{\theta}},\varpi) = \max\left(\overline{R}_u, \frac{4r^n\overline{\Xi}_{u1}(y,u,r,\dot{r},\hat{\theta},\dot{\hat{\theta}})}{c_u\underline{\mu}}, \frac{8r^n\overline{\Pi}(\overline{\Xi}_{u2}(y,u,r,\varpi)+\nu_u)(1+\overline{u}_d^2(y,u,r,\varpi))}{c_u\underline{\mu}}\right) \tag{27}$$

$$\Omega_u(y,u,r,\dot{r},\hat{\theta},\dot{\hat{\theta}},\varpi,r_u) = \max\left(\overline{\Omega}_u, \frac{2\Pi^2(r_u)r^n}{c_u\Pi'(r_u)}\Big(\frac{\overline{\Xi}_{u1}(y,u,r,\dot{r},\hat{\theta},\dot{\hat{\theta}})}{\Pi(r_u)} + \overline{\Xi}_{u2}(y,u,r,\varpi)+\nu_u\Big)\right) \tag{28}$$

[9] F. Mazenc, M. Malisoff, and Z. Lin, "On input-to-state stability for nonlinear systems with delayed feedbacks," in *Proc. of the American Control Conference*, New York, NY, July 2007, pp. 4804–4809.

[10] A. Ilchmann and E. P. Ryan, "On gain adaptation in adaptive control," *IEEE Trans. on Automatic Control*, vol. 48, no. 5, pp. 895–899, May 2003.

[11] L. Praly, "Asymptotic stabilization via output feedback for lower triangular systems with output dependent incremental rate," *IEEE Trans. on Automatic Control*, vol. 48, no. 6, pp. 1103–1108, June 2003.

[12] P. Krishnamurthy and F. Khorrami, "Global adaptive output feedback tracking for nonlinear systems linear in unmeasured states," in *Proc. of the American Control Conference*, Arlington, VA, June 2001, pp. 4814–4819.

[13] P. Krishnamurthy and F. Khorrami, "Decentralized control of large-scale nonlinear systems in generalized output-feedback canonical form," in *Proc. of the IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, Orlando, FL, Dec. 2001, pp. 1322–1327.

[14] P. Krishnamurthy, F. Khorrami, and R. S. Chandra, "Global high-gain-based observer and backstepping controller for generalized output-feedback canonical form," *IEEE Trans. on Automatic Control*, vol. 48, no. 12, pp. 2277–2284, Dec. 2003.

[15] P. Krishnamurthy and F. Khorrami, "Decentralized control and disturbance attenuation for large-scale nonlinear systems in generalized output-feedback canonical form," *Automatica*, vol. 39, no. 11, pp. 1923–1933, Nov. 2003.

[16] P. Krishnamurthy and F. Khorrami, "Robust adaptive control for nonlinear systems in generalized output-feedback canonical form," *International Journal of Adaptive Control and Signal Processing*, vol. 17, no. 4, pp. 285–311, May 2003.

[17] H. Ito, "State-dependent scaling problems and stability of interconnected iISS and ISS systems," *IEEE Trans. on Automatic Control*, vol. 51, no. 10, pp. 1626–1643, Oct. 2006.

[18] Z. Lin, "Low gain and low-and-high gain feedback: A review and some recent results," in *Proc. of the IEEE Conf. on Decision and Control*, Shanghai, China, Dec. 2009, pp. lii–lxi.

[19] P. Krishnamurthy and F. Khorrami, "Application of a dynamic high-gain scaling methodology to servocompensator design," *International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control*, vol. 19, no. 8, pp. 937–964, May 2009.

[20] S. Nazrulla and H. K. Khalil, "Robust Stabilization of Non-Minimum Phase Nonlinear Systems Using Extended High-Gain Observers," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 56, no. 4, pp. 802–813, April 2011.

[21] P. Krishnamurthy and F. Khorrami, "A dual high gain controller for the uncertain generalized output-feedback canonical form with appended dynamics driven by all states," in *Proc. of the American Control Conference*, Denver, CO, June 2003, pp. 4766–4771.

[22] P. Krishnamurthy and F. Khorrami, "A high-gain scaling technique for adaptive output feedback control of feedforward systems," *IEEE Trans. on Automatic Control*, vol. 49, no. 12, pp. 2286–2292, Dec. 2004.

[23] P. Krishnamurthy and F. Khorrami, "Dynamic high-gain scaling: state and output feedback with application to systems with ISS appended dynamics driven by all states," *IEEE Trans. on Automatic Control*, vol. 49, no. 12, pp. 2219–2239, Dec. 2004.

[24] G. Kaliora, A. Astolfi, and L. Praly, "Norm estimators and global output feedback stabilization of nonlinear systems with ISS inverse dynamics," *IEEE Trans. on Automatic Control*, vol. 51, no. 3, pp. 493–498, March 2006.

[25] P. Krishnamurthy and F. Khorrami, "High-gain output-feedback control for nonlinear systems based on multiple time scaling," *Systems and Control Letters*, vol. 56, no. 1, pp. 7–15, Jan. 2007.

[26] P. Krishnamurthy and F. Khorrami, "Generalized state scaling and applications to feedback, feedforward, and non-triangular nonlinear systems," *IEEE Trans. on Automatic Control*, vol. 52, no. 1, pp. 102–108, Jan. 2007.

[27] P. Krishnamurthy and F. Khorrami, "Adaptive output-feedback control of feedforward systems with uncertain parameters coupled with all states," in *Proc. of the American Control Conference*, New York, NY, July 2007, pp. 480–485.

[28] P. Krishnamurthy and F. Khorrami, "Feedforward systems with ISS appended dynamics: Adaptive output-feedback stabilization and disturbance attenuation," *IEEE Trans. on Automatic Control*, vol. 53, no. 1, pp. 405–412, Feb. 2008.

[29] P. Krishnamurthy and F. Khorrami, "Dual high-gain-based adaptive output-feedback control for a class of nonlinear systems," International Journal of Adaptive Control and Signal Processing, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 23–42, Feb. 2008.

[30] P. Krishnamurthy and F. Khorrami, "Output-feedback control of nonlinear delayed systems: A dynamic high-gain scaling approach," Dynamics of Continuous, Discrete and Impulsive Systems. Special Issue. vol. 17, no. 6, pp. 909-934, 2010.

[31] P. Krishnamurthy and F. Khorrami, "Adaptive output-feedback control of a general class of uncertain feedforward systems via a dynamic scaling approach," *IET Control Theory and Applications*, vol. 5, no. 5, pp. 681–692, March 2011.

[32] P. Krishnamurthy and F. Khorrami, "A singular perturbation based global dynamic high gain scaling control design for systems with nonlinear input uncertainties," *IEEE Trans. on Automatic Control*, vol. 58, no. 10, pp. 2686–2692, Oct. 2013.

[33] P. Krishnamurthy and F. Khorrami, "Dynamic High Gain Scaling Based Output Feedback for Nonlinear Systems with Time-Delayed Input Unmodeled Dynamics," in *Proc. of the European Control Conference*, Strasbourg, France, June 2014, pp. 1777–1782.

[34] P. Krishnamurthy and F. Khorrami, "A dynamic scaling based control redesign procedure for uncertain nonlinear systems with input unmodeled dynamics," in *Proc. of the IFAC World Congress*, Cape Town, South Africa, Aug. 2014.

[35] P. Krishnamurthy and F. Khorrami, "Multiple-dynamic-scaling output-feedback control for uncertain strict-feedback-like systems with input unmodeled dynamics," in *Proc. of the American Control Conference*, Chicago, IL, July 2015, pp. 2685–2690.

[36] V. R. Saxena, J. O'Reilly, and P. V. Kokotovic, "Singular perturbations and time-scale methods in control theory: survey 1976-1983," *Automatica*, vol. 20, no. 3, pp. 273–293, 1984.

[37] N. Hovakimyan, E. Lavretsky, and A. Sasane, "Dynamic inversion for nonaffine-in-control systems via time-scale separation: Part I," *Journal of Dyn. and Control Systems*, vol. 13, no. 4, pp. 451–465, Oct. 2007.

[38] A. Chakrabortty and M. Arcak, "Time-scale separation redesigns for stabilization and performance recovery of uncertain nonlinear systems," *Automatica*, vol. 45, no. 1, pp. 34–44, 2009.

[39] P. Krishnamurthy and F. Khorrami, "Conditions for uniform solvability of parameter-dependent Lyapunov equations with applications," in *Proc. of the American Control Conference*, Boston, MA, July 2004, pp. 3896-3901.

[40] P. Krishnamurthy and F. Khorrami, "On uniform solvability of parameter-dependent Lyapunov inequalities and applications to various problems," *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, vol. 45, no. 4, pp. 1147-1164, Sep. 2006.